UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,334	09/16/2003	Yukio Tajima	117192	9252
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 05/12/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/662,334	TAJIMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

	being it. ewearingen	2140	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance very 1.114. The reply must be filed very	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (i	102 021).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t		-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) chiected to:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20 and 22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Jason D Cardone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendments to the claims would require further search and consideration, as new claim limitations have been added which were not part of the initial search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are directed toward the proposed claim amendments, which require further search and consideration.

Applicant argues the system is not an alarm system because the claims do not state the word alarm. Applicant should argue the alleged difference between a network alert and a network alarm if the claims are not a network alarm system, as one of ordinary skill in the art considers the two terms to be synonymous.

Applicant argues the Porras reference failed to disclose executable instructions for an authenticated user and non-executable instructions for a non-authenticated user, because Applicant states the examiner admitted in the interview of 4/23/2008 that the examiner failed to understand what Applicant intended by this amendment. Applicant's representative also conceded in the interview of 4/23/2008 that it was unclear what executable instructions for an authenticated user and non-executable instructions for a non-authenticated user meant. In light of the fact that both the examiner and Applicant's representative agreed that it was unclear what executable instructions for an authenticated user and non-executable instructions for an authenticated user meant, Applicant may wish to authorize an appropriate amendment to the claim language.